

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 7-11, 13-16 and 19 remain pending in the present application. Claims 10, 11, 13-16 and 19 are allowable. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

The undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiner Freay for the courtesies extended to him during the personal interview on June 28, 2007. At the interview, above Claim 1 was discussed. The Examiner indicated that since the secondary references included covers to prohibit liquid from entering into the fan, it appeared that these references do not teach the liquid impermeable seal as claimed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of Fan-Tastic Vent Model 4000R brochure further in view of the Applicant's earlier patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,633,769) and further in view of Kottmann (U.S. Patent No. 3,030,145). The Examiner alleges that this combination would render Applicant's invention obvious to those skilled in the art.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 further defines the rigid casing sealing the motor and associated bearings creating a liquid impermeable seal to enable the air circulation device to be subject to highly pressurized liquids to clean the fan blades while preventing corrosion and damage due to the liquid.

The art relied on by the Examiner fails to provide such a teaching. The Chiu reference cited by the Examiner illustrates a box fan. The Examiner concedes in his

Office Action that Chiu does not disclose the liquid impermeable seal enabling their circulation device to be subject to highly pressurized liquids. The Examiner alleges that Applicant's 4000R brochure and prior patent illustrate these features. However, both the 4000R brochure and Applicant's prior patent include a cover. The cover prohibits liquid from entering into the fan. Thus, these references teach away from any type of highly pressurized fluid entering into the fan. Thus, none of the references cited by the Examiner illustrate Applicant's claim.

Accordingly, Applicant believes Claim 1 to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, Claims 5, 7, 8 and 9, which depend from Claim 1, are patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 5, 2007

By: 

W. R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,308

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/lkj